© JS 44 (Ref. 12/07) (CAND Rev 1/10) Case3:10-cv-05575-ME_L_Document1_Filed12/08/10 Page1 of 6

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.) **PLAINTIFFS** (a) DEFENDANT San Francisco Technology Inc. Howell Ventures Ltd. (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Santa Clara County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq., Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq., Mount & Stoelker, P.C., RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650, 333 W. San Carlos St., San Jose, CA 95110; (408) 279-7000 v 10-05575 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF PTF DEF U.S. Government 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State **—** 4 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State U.S. Government 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place □ 5 Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) of Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a 3 Foreign Nation Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionment 120 Marine 620 Other Food & Drug 310 Airplane 423 Withdrawal ■410 Antitrust 362 Personal Injury-130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice 625 Drug Related Seizure 28 USC 157 430 Banks and Banking 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 881 450 Commerce 150 Recovery of Overpayment 1630 Liquor Laws 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 460 Deportation PROPERTY RIGHTS & Enforcement of Judgment 640 R.R. & Truck Slander Asbestos Personal 3 470 Racketeer Influenced and 820 Copyrights 151 Medicare Act 330 Federal Employers 650 Airline Regs. Injury Product Corrupt Organizations 830 Patent 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability 660 Occupational 480 Consumer Credit Liability 340 Trademark Student Loans 340 Marine Safety/Health 490 Cable/Sat TV PERSONAL PROPERTY (Excl. Veterans) 690 Other 345 Marine Product 🕇 810 Selective Service 370 Other Fraud 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability 350 Securities/Commodities/ 371 Truth in Lending **LABOR** SOCIAL SECURITY of Veteran's Benefits 350 Motor Vehicle Exchange 380 Other Personal 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle 🗖 875 Customer Challenge 710 Fair Labor Standards 861 HIA (1395ff) Property Damage 190 Other Contract Product Liability Act 862 Black Lung (923) 12 USC 3410 Property Damage 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions Product Liability 196 Franchise 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting 864 SSID Title XVI 3891 Agricultural Acts PRISONER ■ 892 Economic Stabilization Act & Disclosure Act 3865 RS1 (405(g)) REAL PROPERTY **CIVIL RIGHTS** 1893 Environmental Matters PETITIONS 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 394 Energy Allocation Act 210 Land Condemnation 441 Voting 7510 Motions to Vacate 395 Freedom of Information 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 220 Forec losure 1442 Employment Sentence FEDERAL TAX SUITS Act Security Act 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: 900Appeal of Fee 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 240 Torts to Land Accommodations 530 General Determination 245 Tort Product Liability 444 Welfare or Defendant) 535 Death Penalty Under Equal Access 290 All Other Real Property 445 Amer. w/Disabilities 540 Mandamus & Other IRS--Third Party **IMMIGRATION** to Justice 26 USC 7609 Employment 🗖 550 Civil Rights 1462 Naturalization Application 3950 Constitutionality of 46 Amer. w/Disabilities 3555 Prison Condition 463 Habeas Corpus State Statutes Other Alien Detainee 3440 Other Civil Rights 465 Other Immigration V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Transferred from Appeal to District ☐ 1 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 another district ☐ 6 Multidistrict 7 Judge from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court (specify) Magistrate Reopened Litigation Judgment Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 35 U.S.C. Section 292 VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: False patent marking VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION **DEMAND \$** 500 per offense CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: **COMPLAINT:** UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Yes No VIII. RELATED CASE(S) PLEASE REFER TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 CONCERNING REQUIREMENT TO FILE "NOTICE OF RELATED CASE" IF ANY IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND X SAN JOSE EUREKA SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 12/8/2010

e for	Case3:10-cv-05575-MEJ Documer		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		mount.com District Court District of California	
10 11	Plaintiff	CasyNo $10-05575$ Complaint	WE
MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740 TELEPHONE (408) 279-7000 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	Howell Ventures Ltd. Defendant	Demand For Jury Trial	
22 23 24			
25			

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

11

12

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740 13

TELEPHONE (408) 279-7000 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

24

23

26

25

27

28

Oui tam relator San Francisco Technology Inc. ("SF Tech") files this Complaint against defendant Howell Ventures Ltd. ("Howell Ventures") and alleges as follows:

Nature of Action

1. This is a qui tam action to impose civil fines for false marking. As alleged further below, Howell Ventures has falsely marked articles in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 292 and must be civilly fined for each offense: "Whoever marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with any unpatented article, the word 'patent' or any word or number importing that the same is patented, for the purpose of deceiving the public ... Shall be fined not more than \$500 for every such offense." Howell Ventures has falsely marked products with patents to induce the public to believe that each such product is protected by each patent listed and with knowledge that nothing is protected by an expired patent. Accordingly, Howell Ventures falsely marked articles with intent to deceive the public.

Parties

- 2. Plaintiff San Francisco Technology is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Jose, California.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Howell Ventures is a Canadian business entity with its principal place of business at 4850 Rte 102, Upper Kingsclear, New Brunswick, Canada, E3E 1P8.

Jurisdiction & Venue

- 4. This court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a) and 1355(a).
 - 5. Venue is appropriate in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1395(a).
- 6. Upon information and belief, this court has personal jurisdiction over Howell Ventures because Howell Ventures has sold its products, including its falsely marked products in California and in this District and/or in the stream of commerce with knowledge that they would be sold in California and in this District. Upon information and belief, such sales are substantial, continuous, and systematic. Howell Ventures advertises its products, including its falsely marked products on its web site, at http://www.suregrip-hvl.com/. Howell Ventures advertises on that web site that its products are sold at many retail stores located in California and in this District, including Access

10

20

27

Options, Driving Specialties, and Nor-Cal Mobility.¹

Intradistrict Assignment

7. This case is appropriate for District-wide assignment under Civil Local Rule 3-2(c) because the claims in this Complaint arise under 35 U.S.C. § 292, which is codified with the patent statutes.

Howell Ventures' False Marking

- 8. SF Tech incorporates by reference all above allegations.
- 9. Upon information and belief, Howell Ventures makes and sells many types of products, including the Sure Grip Hand Controls with AutoLock (the "Accused Product").
- 10. Howell Ventures causes or contributes to the marking and advertising of products with the U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509, including, but not limited to, the Accused Product.
- 11. U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509, entitled "Vehicle hand control device", issued on February 19, 1991.
 - 12. Howell Ventures individually marks the Accused Product:

MADE IN CANADA BY: HOWELL VENTURES LTD. US PAT. # 4993509

- 13. U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 is an expired patent. Upon information and belief, U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 expired no later than February 19, 1999. Upon information and belief, U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 would have naturally expired no later than February 3, 2010, but it expired earlier because the patentee decided not to pay a maintenance fee.
- 14. Howell Ventures' falsely marked products are being sold in 2010 with such false markings, after the expiration of U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509. A Sure Grip Hand Control with AutoLock marked "SERIAL # 21596" was sold on or about August 30, 2010.
- 15. Howell Ventures is a sophisticated company and has many years of experience applying for, obtaining, and maintaining patent rights. Howell Ventures also has extensive experience manufacturing products and either marking or not marking them with words or numbers indicating that such products are protected by patents or pending applications.

http://www.suregrip-hvl.com/dealerlocator.html?dealercountry=USA&dealerprovince=CA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	16.	Howell Ventures (including Howell Ventures' patent counsel) knew or should have
known	that the	e term of U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 expired no later than its expiration date.

- 17. Howell Ventures is no longer paying maintenance fees to the United States Patent and Trademark Office to maintain U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509.
- 18. Howell Ventures knew or should have known that U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 had already expired at the same time Howell Ventures was marking and advertising products with U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509.
- 19. Howell Ventures knows, or reasonably should know, that U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 does not protect the Accused Product, or any products whatsoever.
- 20. Howell Ventures could have no reasonable belief that it was proper to mark and advertise products with the numbers of the expired U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509, and the false marking was done with intent to deceive the public by, including, but not limited to, misusing its patent rights to extend the term of its patents and inhibiting competition.
- 21. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design is and has been a competitor of Howell Ventures for many years in the making and selling of assistive devices that enable persons with physical disabilities to drive automobiles. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design initially intended to make and sell a product substantially identical to the Accused Product in or around 2002. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design began making and selling a product substantially identical to the Accused Product in or around 2009. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design delayed making and selling a product substantially identical to the Accused Product because Howell Ventures labeled the Accused Product with: "US PAT. # 4993509." Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design understood the marking "US PAT. # 4993509" to mean that U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 actually covered the Accused Product and was currently active and unexpired. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design relied on Howell Ventures' marking on the Accused Product and was actually deceived into believing that U.S. Patent No. 4,993,509 covered the Accused Product from the period 2002 – 2009. Upon information and belief, Mobility Products & Design, and its principals, lost profit and income and were otherwise harmed by Howell Ventures' false marking.

Case3:10-cv-05575-MEJ Document1 Filed12/08/10 Page6 of 6

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
I ELEPHONE (408) 279-7000	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740 1

22.	For at least the reasons set forth herein, Howell Ventures has wrongfully and illegal
advertised	atent rights which it does not possess, and, as a result, has likely benefited in at least
 maintainin	its market share in the marketplace.

- 23. For at least the reasons set forth herein, Howell Ventures has wrongfully and illegally advertised patent rights which it does not possess, and, as a result, has likely caused the retail price of its Accused Product to be inflated above normal market levels, and has caused the public to face inflated prices for its products.
- 24. The public deception, and/or competitive harm caused by each of Howell Ventures' false markings has and continues to harm the United States and the public, including relator SF Tech, a representative of the public incurring the cost and time associated with this enforcement.

Demand For Judgment

SF Tech demands judgment against Howell Ventures, as follows:

- 1. A declaration that Howell Ventures violated 35 U.S.C. § 292.
- 2. An accounting of the number, sales, and revenue of any falsely marked articles not presented at trial.
 - 3. A civil fine of \$500 for each offense half paid to the U.S., and half paid to SF Tech.
 - 4. Costs, including attorney fees.
 - 5. A finding that this is an exceptional case.
 - 6. Any other relief the court deems appropriate.

Demand For Jury Trial

SF Tech demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Date: November 29, 2010 Mount & Stoelker, P.C., /s/ Dan Fingerman

Counsel for San Francisco Technology Inc.

[]

Complaint